

5213 SHORELINE CIRCLE
SANFORD, FLORIDA 32771
PHONE: 407-489-0606 - MOBILE
407-302-9970 - OFFICE
FAX: 407-302-9973
E-MAIL: LEETZOWM@BELLSOUTH.NET

MICHAEL L. LEETZOW, PA

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUN 24 2004

OFFICIAL

Fax

To: PTO - Art Unit 2874 - Ex. K. S. Wood **From:** Michael L. Leetzow
Fax: (703) 872-9306 **Pages:** 11
Phone: **Date:** June 24, 2004
Re: Response to Office Action **CC:**
☒ **Urgent** ☒ **For Review** ☐ **Please Comment** ☐ **Please Reply** ☐ **Please Recycle**

• **Comments:**

I hereby certify that that a Response to an Office Action for Serial No. 10/099,665 is being sent by facsimile to 703 872 9306 on June 24, 2004.


Michael L. Leetzow

NOTICE: This facsimile message and all attachments transmitted with it may contain legally privileged and confidential information intended solely for the use of the addressee. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any reading, dissemination, distribution, copying, or other use of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone (407-302-9970) or by electronic mail (leetzowm@bellsouth.net), and destroy this facsimile message and all copies thereof. Thank you.

Date of Mailing: June 24, 2004

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile to (703) 872-9300 on the date indicated above.

Michael L. Leetzow

Date of Signature 6/24/04

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 24 2004

Applicant: Sharon Carnevale et al.)
Serial No.: 10/099,665)
Filing Date: March 15, 2002)
Title: Optical Circuit Having Legs in a)
Stacked Configuration and an)
Associated Fabrication Method)

Group Art Unit: 2874

Examiner: Wood, K.S.

OFFICIAL

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
Commissioner for Patents
P.O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed March 24, 2004, Applicants respond as follows:

REMARKS

In the above-referenced Office Action, the Examiner indicated that the arguments filed on December 8, 2003, were fully considered but were not persuasive; rejected claims 1-10, 16-18, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0015563 to Murakimi et al.; rejected claims 11-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,240,232 to Schneider et al.; and indicated that claims 19 and 20 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if